

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/939,531	HOFFSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kambiz Zand	2132	

All Participants:

(1) Kambiz Zand.

(2) Martin Novack.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 May 2005

Time: 2:05 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

101 issue.

Claims discussed:

62-72

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that claims 62-72 are subject to 101 non-statutory rejection due to the use of the phrase "carrier wave signal" used on page 4 of the specification. It was further agreed that in order to resolve the 101 issue, the specification be amended by Examiner's amendment by deleting the phrases "; or on carrier wave signal received through a network, wireless network or modem, including radio-frequency signals and infrared signals" from lines 32-34 of page 4 of the specification. It was also agreed that the phrase "excluding" be added instead of the phrase "or" on line 26 of page 4 of the specification. It was understood that the above changes would resolve the 101 issue and the claims would be allowable as the result.